

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/960,114	09/21/2001	Kenneth B. Higgins	5113B	5752	
75	90 06/21/		EXAMINER		
Milliken & Company			JUSKA, CHERYL ANN		
P.O. Box 1927	•				
Spartanburg, SC 29304			· ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
. 0,			1271	<u> </u>	

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

W

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/960,114	HIGGINS ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Cheryl Juska	1771		

Advisory Action	09/960,114 HIGGINS ET AL.					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Cheryl Juska	1771				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addr	9SS			
	THE REPLY FILED 09 June 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.					
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filling a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. 						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b)	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2) a	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)			
2. The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>09 June 2005</u> . A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);						
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a 			the issues for			
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		jootoa olaliillo.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.	121. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). 	· ——	, timely filed amendme	ent canceling			
 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: 	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ wilded below or appended.	rill be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 88,90,92-123,125-128,131 and 149. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).						
10. ☑ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.						
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)				
		Cheryl Juska Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1771				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: While the newly submitted Norton declaration and the previously submitted Kilpatrick declarations have been considered, said declarations are insufficient to overcome the standing prior art rejections. Specifically, while said declarations establish the accepted wisdom in the art is that rebond foam would not be suited for successful carpet tiles, applicant has failed to show unexpected results. Applicant's arguments of unexpected results are insufficient evidence. Proceeding contrary to the accepted wisdom in the art is not sufficient to show nonobviousness when the prior art has an explicit teaching thereto. However, the successful results achieved are unexpected and contrary to the accepted wisdom. One skilled in the art might expect rebond foam to produce a commercially unsuccessful carpet tile due to the lack of uniformity in thickness and denstiy. This is the accepted wisdom in the art. But, proceeding contrary to the accepted wisdom to achieve advantageous or unexpected results is evidence of nonobviousness.

With resepct to applicant's assertion of commercial success and copying by others, it is noted that secondary considerations of nonobviousness must be supported by evidence. Applicant's mere statement is not sufficient evidence. See MPEP 716, 716.03, and 716.06.

2